

July 29, 2004

Mr. Doug Cooley  
Idaho Public Utilities Commission  
P. O. Box 83720  
Boise, Idaho 83720

RECEIVED   
FILED

2004 AUG -2 AM 8:04

IDAHO PUBLIC  
UTILITIES COMMISSION

Re: Case No. GNR-T-04-2

Dear Mr. Cooley:

We were completely disappointed when we read your memo of 7/26/2004 regarding the survey summary of Soldiers Meadow residents. We would like to speak with your supervisor or another Public Utilities Commission representative with some authority and open-mindedness. We feel that your ability to present the situation at Forest and Soldiers Meadow is inadequate.

Have you forgotten our many conversations during the two years from 2001 to 2003? Your neat little summary in the first paragraph of your memo has omitted many of the pertinent facts of the situation. We even had conversations with you in 2000 before the petition for service was circulated. From the very beginning in July of 2001, we were told that the petition for phone service to Forest and Soldiers Meadow would be considered as "All or None." To us this means that we will receive phones at Soldiers Meadow and Forest or no one would receive phones. We repeatedly heard this statement from you for over 2 years. We are not aware of the issues of an extension tariff or an exchange area. We only had **your** information to rely on. And that information was **totally inadequate** to us as consumers (THE PUBLIC).

Also, you omitted in your first paragraph that the PUC allowed Qwest to change their tariff from a 1/2 mile credit per customer (which is what was used to extend to Forest at no cost and the Soldiers Meadow residents could have easily been included) to only \$1,600 per customer now. At the same time that this change was allowed, why wasn't the service area boundary changed to include Soldiers Meadow, approximately 2 miles from the boundary line? We were here asking for service. Why weren't we included? The answer we feel is that your information to us was lacking and inadequate. On at least 2 occasions, we asked if we should request a public hearing at that time to discuss the situation. But we were repeatedly told that it wasn't necessary and that they were working on it.

Our petition for service to Soldiers Meadow should have been considered in its entirety at the same time as the extension to Forest. The PUC allowed Qwest to only extend to Forest and not to change the service boundary and then to proceed to change their tariff. At the estimated cost of \$5.00 to \$10.00 per foot to extend the line, in today's market that 1/2 mile credit given to the Forest extension is worth \$13,200 to \$26,400. How could you (PUC) and Qwest give that away last year to Forest and expect the Soldiers Meadow residents to believe that a \$1,600 credit allowance is appropriate this year?

Mr. Cooley  
July 29, 2004  
Page 2

Also, the PUC allowed Qwest to bring limited service to Forest, inadequate to serve the Soldiers Meadow residents. Were they so certain that they would never have to serve us at Soldiers Meadow? How did they determine this? Did they receive a guarantee that the service area boundary would never be changed? Could the Soldiers Meadow residents have requested a public hearing to change the service area boundary before the service was brought to Forest? There are too many discrepancies and questionable changes which have occurred over the years. Now Qwest and the PUC would expect the Soldiers Meadow residents to pay for the upgrade to serve them, which is unnecessary added expense.

You also discreetly allege some disinterest in service by stating that you sent out 50 surveys and only have 22 returned as of 7/26/04. We clearly advised you that the estimated number of interested parties was nearer to 30. And we feel it is unfair and clearly unjust to make us pay to extend the service due to the facts stated above. Extending phones to Forest because it was in the exchange area established prior to 1913 and not initiating the boundary change to include Soldiers Meadow at the same time is negligence and an injustice.

We would like to have a confirmed date for the public hearing in Lewiston. Tentatively, in June, we selected August 24, 2004. Please advise us when the hearing will be held. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Vivian & Vlado Maras", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Vivian & Vlado Maras  
P. O. Box 280  
Winchester, ID 83555  
(208) 791-3570

cc: ✓  
Commissioners Kjellander, Smith, Hansen